

**Remarks**

Acknowledgement of the foreign priority claims to PCT/GB00/02302 and GB0030304 made in the parent application and of the cited art is appreciated.

Claims 36-46 are pending and stand rejected. In response, and in view of the Examiner's helpful comments, Claims 36, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 44 are amended; and Claims 42 and 45 are canceled. No new subject matter is added. The Examiner is requested to reconsider the application in view of the claim amendments and remarks below and find the claims allowable.

The claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as indefinite for reasons which are discussed individually below along with their amendments.

a. Claim 36 is rejected as not being clear in regarding to making compounds with  $R_f = R_g$  because the synthesis step in (b) does not cover the situation when  $R_f = R_g$ . This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed: Steps (a) and (b) are separated by "or" and step (b) is introduced by the qualifier "when  $R_f$  is  $-(CH_2)_n-R_c$ ," to show that step (b) is limited to only certain values of  $R_f$ . Accordingly, the claim is not indefinite.

b. In Claim 36 (and Claims 38 and 41), a portion of the definition of  $R_g$  is subsequently excluded by proviso. To obviate any uncertainty and the basis of rejection, Claims 36, 38 and 41 are amended so that the particular portion of the definition and the proviso which excludes it are both deleted so that only the claimed value for  $R_g$  remains.

c. The term "amido" is said to be indefinite. In the description at page 25, line 27 (and in original Claim 10) the definition of "amido" as "(CONH<sub>2</sub>)" is provided. Accordingly, to obviate the basis for rejection, in each of Claims 36, 38, 40, 41 and 44, following the first occurrence of "amido," the further definition "(CONH<sub>2</sub>)" is provided.

d. Claim 39 is amended as suggested to expressly claim "unsubstituted phenyl" to overcome the rejection.

e. Claim 41 is amended to introduce the values defined in Claim 42 for Pg<sup>3</sup>, and Claim 42 is canceled. Similarly, Claim 44 is amended to introduce the values defined in

Claim 45 for Pg<sup>1</sup>, and Claim 45 is canceled. Accordingly, the basis for rejection is obviated as suggested.

It is believed that this Response requires no fee. However, The Commissioner hereby is authorized to charge any additional fee (other than the Issue Fee and Publication Fee) which may be required by this Response, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 05-0840.

The Examiner is encouraged to call concerning any detail to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas E. Jackson/

Thomas E. Jackson  
Patent Attorney  
Registration No. 33064  
Phone: 317/277-3735

Eli Lilly and Company  
Patent Division  
P.O. Box 6288  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6288

19 December 2006